

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed December 22, 2005. Claims 1-40 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-9, 11-20, 22-29 and 31-40 were rejected, and Claims 10, 21 and 30 were objected to. Claims 1-40 remain pending in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SECTION 112 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 9 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the term “adapted to” renders the claim indefinite. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to rely on *In re Hutchinson*, 154 F.2d 135, 69 USPQ 138 (CCPA 1946) as a basis for the instant rejection (Office Action, page 2). In *Hutchinson*, the court considered the introductory phrase “adapted for use in the fabrication of a metal template or the like” to not “constitute a limitation in any patentable sense” (154 F.2d at 138, 69 USPQ at 141). In *Hutchinson*, the court did not state that the phrase “adapted to,” *per se*, renders a claim indefinite. To the contrary, the recitation of “adapted to” in Claims 1, 9 and 31 imposes a capability limitation that must be met by any prior art reference(s) cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, Claims 1, 9 and 31 fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-9, 11-20 and 31-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0151328 to Shin et al. (hereinafter “*Shin*”). Claims 22-27 and 29

were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,456,499 issued to Nakajima et al. (hereinafter “*Nakajima*”). Claims 35-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0021250 to Asano et al. (hereinafter “*Asano*”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Shin Reference

Of the rejected claims, Claims 1, 11, 16 and 31 are independent. Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites “a bezel having a bezel flange adapted to support a screen” and “an antenna disposed at least partially between the bezel flange and a portion of the screen.” *Shin* appears to disclose a display unit 35 having a frame 37 extending about a display panel or screen 38 (*Shin*, paragraphs 0052 and 0065; figure 2). *Shin* also appears to disclose a case 55 having a side wall 57 that extends downward over a side wall 39 of the frame 37, and an antenna 40 that is attached to the side wall 39 of the frame 37 (*Shin*, paragraphs 0066 and 0067; figure 2). *Shin* further appears to disclose that the side wall 57 of the case 55 extends over the antenna 40 such that the antenna 40 is disposed between the side wall 57 of the case 55 and the side wall 39 of the frame 37 (*Shin*, paragraphs 0065-0069; figure 2). Thus, *Shin* does not disclose or even suggest “an antenna disposed at least partially between the bezel flange and a portion of the screen” as recited by amended Claim 1. To the contrary, the antenna 40 of *Shin* does not appear even approach the screen 38 of *Shin*. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that *Shin* does not anticipate amended Claim 1.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the side wall 57 of the case 55 of *Shin*, which the Examiner appears to consider to correspond to the “bezel flange” recited by Claim 1 (Office action, page 3), is not “adapted to support a screen” as recited by Claim 1. To the contrary, the frame 37 of *Shin* appears to be configured to support the display screen 38 of *Shin* (*Shin*, paragraphs 0065-0069; figure 2), and the antenna 40 of *Shin* is clearly not disposed between the frame 37 of *Shin* and the display screen 38 of *Shin* (*Shin*, figure 2). Therefore, for at least this reason also, Applicant respectfully submits that *Shin* does not anticipate Claim 1.

Independent Claim 11, as amended, recites “means for supporting a screen” and “antenna means disposed at least partially between a flange of the supporting means and an interior surface of the screen” (emphasis added), and independent Claim 16, as amended, recites “providing a screen having an antenna disposed on an interior surface thereof” and “providing a bezel having a bezel flange adapted to support the screen, at least a portion of the antenna disposed between the bezel flange and the screen” (emphasis added). At least for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that *Shin* also does not anticipate amended Claims 11 and 16.

Independent Claim 31 recites “a bezel flange adapted to support a screen, the bezel flange having a conductive path extending therethrough to conductively couple an antenna to an antenna circuit.” In the Office Action, the Examiner apparently considers reference numeral 82 to correspond to the “bezel flange” recited by Claim 31 (“a bezel flange (Generally 82)”) (Office Action, page 5). Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Shin* appears to disclose that reference numeral 82 corresponds to a bracket 82 that is affixed with screws 90 to a side wall 68a of a frame 68 (the frame 68 disposed about a display panel or screen 67) (*Shin*, paragraphs 0117-0120; figure 9). *Shin* also appears to disclose that an antenna 92 is attached to the bracket 82 (via an antenna fixing portion 87), and a coaxial cable 95 is attached to the antenna 92 (*Shin*, paragraphs 0124-0130; figure 9). Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the bracket 82 of *Shin* is not “a bezel flange adapted to support a screen” as recited by Claim 31. To the contrary, the bracket 82 of *Shin* appears to be used for supporting the antenna 92 of *Shin*. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that *Shin* does not anticipate Claim 31.

Claims 2-9, 12-15, 17-20 and 32-34 that depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 11, 16 and 31 are also not anticipated by *Shin* at least because they incorporate the limitations of respective Claims 1, 11, 16 and 31 and also they add additional elements that further distinguish *Shin*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 2-9, 12-15, 17-20 and 32-34 be withdrawn.

Nakajima Reference

Independent Claim 22 recites “a screen,” “a display device disposed adjacent an interior surface of the screen” and “an antenna disposed on the interior surface of the screen.” In the Office action, the Examiner appears to consider reference numeral 10 to correspond to the “screen” recited by Claim 22 (“a screen (10)”) (Office Action, page 6). Applicants respectfully disagree. *Nakajima* appears to disclose a display unit 3 of a portable computer having a liquid crystal display 7 and “display cover 8 includ[ing] a supporting wall 10” (*Nakajima*, column 4, lines 43-65; figure 1). Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the supporting wall 10 of *Nakajima* is clearly not a “screen” as recited by Claim 22. Nor does *Nakajima* appear to disclose any other element that could be considered a “screen” such that “a display device [is] disposed adjacent an interior surface of the screen” as recited by Claim 22. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that *Nakajima* does not anticipate Claim 22.

Claims 23-27 and 29 that depend from independent Claim 22 are also not anticipated by *Nakajima* at least because they incorporate the limitations of Claim 22 and also they add additional elements that further distinguish *Nakajima*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 23-27 and 29 be withdrawn.

Asano Reference

Independent Claim 35 recites “a screen” and “an antenna formed on the screen” (emphasis added). In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to consider the antenna 20 illustrated in figure 16 of *Asano* to be “formed on the screen” of the *Asano* device (Office Action, page 8). Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Asano* appears to disclose an antenna 20 that is attached to a stay 21, and that the stay 21, in turn, is attached to a side portion of a frame 13A of a display unit 13 (*Asano*, paragraphs 0094, 0095, 0103, 0121; figures 5 and 16). Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the antenna 20 of *Asano* is not “formed on the screen” of the *Asano* device. To the contrary, the antenna 20 appears to be attached to the stay 21 of *Asano*, and then the stay 21 of *Asano* is attached to the display unit 13 of *Asano*. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that *Asano* does not anticipate Claim 35.

Claims 36-40 that depend from independent Claim 35 are also not anticipated by *Asano* at least because they incorporate the limitations of Claim 35 and also they add additional elements that further distinguish *Asano*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 36-40 be withdrawn.

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nakajima* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,809,689 issued to Chen (hereinafter “*Chen*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 28 depends from independent Claim 22. As discussed above, Claim 22 is patentable over the cited *Nakajima* reference. Additionally, *Chen* does not appear to remedy, nor has the Examiner relied on *Chen* to remedy, at least the deficiencies of *Nakajima* discussed above. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 28 is patentable over the cited references.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to Claims 10, 21 and 30 as being dependent on a rejected base claims (Claims 1, 16 and 22). Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that Claims 10, 21 and 30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, as discussed above, independent Claims 1, 16 and 22 are patentable over the cited reference. Therefore, Claims 10, 21 and 30 which depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 16 and 22 are also patentable. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicant has overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By: James L Baudino
James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: 3-22-06

Correspondence to:
L.Joy Griebenow
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-3884